STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet
DF-46 (REV 08/15)

Fiscal Year	Business Unit	Department	Priority No.
2016-2017	BU_3930	Department of Pesticide Regulation	2

Budget Request Name	Program	Subprogram
3930-002-BCP-DP-2016-GB	**3540_PESTICIDE PROGRAMS**	**3540046_Monitoring and Surveillance** **3540055_Mitigation of Human Health Risk**

Budget Request Description
Continuing the Air Monitoring Network (AMN)

Budget Request Summary
The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) requests ongoing resources of $468,000 per year from the DPR Fund and 1.5 in position authority. The requested resources include contract funds for laboratory sample analysis and will be used to continue the Air Monitoring Network (AMN). DPR created the AMN as a limited-term project to monitor ambient air pesticide concentrations (including soil fumigants) and calculate the human health risk from exposure to multiple pesticides for long time periods (e.g., annual and lifetime). Without these additional, ongoing resources, DPR will be unable to continue the AMN, which is an important part of its mandated continuing evaluation of registered pesticides to protect human health and the environment.

Requires Legislation	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
☐ Yes ☒ No	

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? ☐ Yes ☒ No *If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.*	Department CIO	Date

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the Department of Technology, or previously by the Department of Finance.
☐ FSR ☐ SPR Project No. Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
L Ford	01.04.2016	John Gaydosh	1-4-16
Department Director	**Date**	**Agency Secretary**	**Date**
Brian Leahy	01.05.2016	[signature]	1/6/16

Department of Finance Use Only

Additional Review: ☐ Capital Outlay ☐ ITCU ☐ FSCU ☐ OSAE ☐ CALSTARS ☐ Dept. of Technology

BCP Type: ☐ Policy ☐ Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature
Original Signed By: Ellen Moratti	1/7/16

A. Budget Request Summary

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) requests ongoing resources of $468,000 per year from the DPR Fund and 1.5 in position authority. The requested resources include contract funds for laboratory sample analysis and will be used to continue the Air Monitoring Network (AMN). DPR created the AMN as a limited-term project to monitor ambient air pesticide concentrations (including soil fumigants) and calculate the human health risk from exposure to multiple pesticides for long time periods (e.g., annual and lifetime). Without these additional, ongoing resources, DPR will be unable to continue the AMN, which is an important part of its mandated continuing evaluation of registered pesticides to protect human health and the environment[1].

B. Background/History

Pesticides are unusual among toxic substances. They are not an unwanted byproduct of another process, for example automobile exhaust. Pesticides are substances produced specifically for their toxicity to a target pest, and to work, they must be purposely introduced into the environment. So, regulation of pesticides does not focus solely on assessing toxicity but also on reducing risk by controlling exposure—how much and how often. That is why DPR and other regulatory agencies focus not on banning pesticides but on protecting people and the environment from harmful exposure.

Before DPR registers a pesticide, DPR scientists evaluate the pesticide's potential exposure to people and the environment. Food and Agricultural Code (FAC) section 12824 requires DPR to "eliminate from use" any pesticide that "endangers the...environment, is not beneficial for the purposes for which it is sold, or is misrepresented." The law also requires DPR to have an "orderly program for the continuous evaluation" of pesticides, after registration. DPR achieves continuous evaluation through monitoring, among other activities.

Pesticide monitoring may be done to find out if air, water, soil, crops, or produce has been contaminated by a pesticide, or to learn the extent of contamination. For example, DPR conducts long-term ground and surface water sampling with this goal in mind. Although DPR has conducted short-term air monitoring, it had never had an ongoing program to monitor for pesticides in air over extended periods of time to determine whether long-term or lifetime exposures are of concern for human health.

If exposure to a pesticide cannot be limited to levels that protect people and the environment from harm, then use may be banned. But the initial step is to impose strict controls on use, and provide incentives to use less pesticides or pesticides that pose less risk. To determine if controls (mitigation measures) are necessary and effective, DPR needs data to answer the following questions:

1. What pesticides, if any, are detected?
2. At what concentrations do they occur and do detected concentrations exceed levels that protect people?
3. For how long and often are the pesticides in air—a few hours (acute exposure), several months (subchronic exposure), annually (chronic), or over a lifetime (cancer risk)?
4. Are existing mitigation measures effective?
5. Are new mitigation measures needed and, if implemented, are they effective?

For pesticides in air, DPR answers these questions using data, when available, from acute bystander (i.e., the people who live, work, and go to school next to fields) application-site air monitoring studies and most recently, the AMN, which addresses long-term exposures that people in a neighboring community might experience.

[1] Food and Agricultural Code (FAC) sections 12824, 12825 and 14021 et seq.; Health and Safety Code sections 39650 et seq.;

Short-Term Studies: Acute Exposure

To evaluate the potential for and protect against *acute* exposure, DPR conducts short-term bystander application-site air monitoring studies. Such monitoring includes designing and conducting studies to: (1) assess potential acute exposure, (2) determine the effectiveness of existing controls, and (3) develop and test new agricultural use practices designed to prevent harm, also known as mitigation measures. Mitigation measures developed to address longer-term exposures have never been evaluated through long-term monitoring. DPR has used modeling to try to estimate their effectiveness. This has been an important gap in DPR's implementation of its continuous evaluation mandate.

Past and current bystander application-site air monitoring studies conducted by DPR's Air Program last a few days to a few weeks and provide acute (and some subchronic) exposure data, which are essential to assess bystander exposure. Historically, DPR also used these acute and subchronic exposures in models to estimate lifetime exposures. Estimating an exposure is much less accurate than calculating an exposure using actual long-term monitoring data and has left DPR open to criticism. We also use monitoring data to increase the resolution of models that we use.

The Need for Long-Term Studies

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, DPR and University of California at Davis developed a cost-effective multi-pesticide analytical method that allowed for analysis and detection of about 25 pesticides from a single sample for use in an 8-week monitoring study in a community in Santa Barbara County. In 2006, DPR used the same method to develop a full one-year study to perfect sample and analytical methods and evaluate the need for long-term monitoring. Results from the one-year study indicated a need for further evaluation of the lifetime exposure (i.e. cancer risk) to 1,3-dichloropropene and provided DPR the data necessary to develop a comprehensive AMN.

In 2011, recognizing the importance and need for data to calculate subchronic and chronic exposure and to evaluate the potential for cancer risk (when appropriate), DPR formed the AMN as a limited-term project to monitor 32 pesticides and five pesticide breakdown products in three California communities: Salinas (Monterey County), Shafter (Kern County), and Ripon (San Joaquin County). The pesticides were selected based on their potential health risks and the amount used. They include all the major fumigants, as well as chlorpyrifos. The communities were selected from a list of 226 communities based on pesticide use on surrounding farmland and demographics, including the percentage of children, the elderly, and farmworkers in the local population.

DPR's AMN is the first in the nation to collect enough data to identify subchronic, chronic, and lifetime exposures to pesticides, rather than rely on short-term monitoring data. DPR's AMN also serves as a model for other countries, with officials from Mexico and France requesting the expertise of DPR staff about how to implement such a unique network.

The AMN has provided data for 32 communities that represent areas of highest agricultural pesticide use in the State. Higher-risk pesticides were identified and targeted for monitoring. DPR collects one 24-hour sample every week year-round at each of three monitoring sites (about 625 samples/year; 5,676 to 6,033 analyses/year). The method developed for the earlier studies allowed DPR to monitor for almost 30 of the higher-risk pesticides in a single sample. The remaining pesticides are each analyzed from separate samples, using pesticide-specific analytical methods.

DPR scientists use data collected from the AMN to assist in deciding whether mitigation measures are needed or are adequate for longer-term exposures. The AMN allows DPR to identify whether common pesticides are present in ambient air and to determine seasonal, annual and multi-year concentrations. It also allows DPR to track trends over time and estimate cumulative exposure to multiple pesticides with common modes of action. Other state agencies and stakeholder groups have used this data in their programs.

While acute exposure health standards exist for some pesticides, no subchronic or chronic exposure or cancer-risk standards exist for pesticides. Since no state or federal regulatory agency has established these health standards for pesticides in air, DPR—in collaboration with other state agencies—

developed acute, subchronic, and chronic screening levels and calculated cancer risk potentials, where appropriate. If DPR finds concentrations of a pesticide exceed a screening level, then this triggers DPR to further evaluate and the pesticide and to take appropriate action.

The goals of the AMN are to provide data that assist in:

1. Assessing potential subchronic and chronic exposure and cancer risks,
2. Developing measures to mitigate risks,
3. Measuring the effectiveness of newly implemented regulatory requirements, and
4. Tracking trends in air concentrations over time.

To establish and maintain the AMN, resources were directed away from bystander application-site air monitoring studies. Current staffing levels and laboratory sample analysis contract funds do not allow DPR to simultaneously conduct essential bystander application-site air monitoring studies, and continue its AMN, both of which are part of DPR's continuous evaluation mandate.

Resource History
(Dollars in thousands)

Program Budget	PY - 4	PY - 3	PY - 2	PY - 1	PY
Authorized Expenditures	3,097	3,242	3,168	3,424	3,294
Actual Expenditures	2,814	2,985	2,855	3,304	3,141
Authorized Positions	16.4	16.3	16.3	17.0	16.0
Filled Positions	15.6	15.2	15.1	15.1	14.7
Vacancies	.8	1.2	1.2	1.9	1.4

Workload History

(Hours required)

Workload Measure	PY - 4	PY - 3	PY - 2	PY - 1	PY	CY
Select, Order and Purchase Sample Collection Equipment (e.g., pumps, sorption tubes)	80	80	80	80	80	80
Create and Print Sample Documentation (e.g., Chain of Custody form, Standard Operating Procedures, Sample Labels)	200	200	200	200	200	200
Troubleshoot Equipment	208	208	208	208	208	208
Schedule Sample Collection	52	52	52	52	52	52
Purchase Supplies as Needed (e.g., dry ice)	26	26	26	26	26	26
Arrange Travel for Sampling Trips	39	39	39	39	39	39
Interview and Train New Staff	34	34	34	34	34	34
Collect Samples – Site #1	416	416	416	416	416	416
Collect Samples – Site #2	624	624	624	624	624	624
Collect Samples – Site #3	312	312	312	312	312	312
Transport Samples from Field to Laboratory for Analysis	52	52	52	52	52	52
Enter results into Network Database	416	416	416	416	416	416
Analyze and Evaluate Sampling, Statistical, and Modeling Data	468	468	468	468	468	468

Write AMN Report (including draft edits and responses to stakeholder comments)	583	583	583	583	583	583
Review AMN report	104	104	104	104	104	104
Present Data at Meetings	10	10	10	10	10	10

C. State Level Considerations

DPR is the public agency responsible for protecting California and its residents from adverse human health and environmental effects caused by the use of pesticides. Its mission is to protect human health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use, and by fostering reduced-risk pest management. Protecting the air we breathe is one of DPR's highest priorities. DPR focuses not only on preventing health problems that can be caused by pesticide air toxins, but also on reducing pesticide emissions that contribute to air pollution.

This proposal directly supports the California Environmental Protection Agency's (CalEPA's) and DPR's current policies, priorities, and initiatives. This proposal meets the following CalEPA Strategic Vision (2001):

Goal 2: Air that is healthy to breathe, sustains and improves our ecosystems, and preserves natural and cultural resources.

Goal 5: Communities that are free from unacceptable human health and ecological risks due to exposure from hazardous substances and other potential harmful agents.

Goal 8: Continuous improvement and application of science and technology.

This proposal addresses the following goal and objectives in DPR's Strategic Plan (2013):

Goal 1: Protect people and the environment—Assure California's environment is not adversely affected by pesticides and that all people are protected from unacceptable pesticide risks. Objectives: continuously evaluate and respond to risks to the environment from pesticide use; use state-of-the art scientific practices and technologies to advance the evaluation and management of pesticides.

Goal 2: Advance the research, development, and adoption of effective pest management systems that reduce risk to people and the environment. Objectives: promote adoption of reduced-risk pest management systems and practices; advance reduced-risk pest management systems and practices for California by providing policy, scientific, and technical leadership and collaboration at local, state, national, and international forums.

DPR is not aware of any impacts on other state departments if the AMN is not continued. DPR has identified the following areas of potential support: California school districts statewide; local, county, and state health agencies; rural community groups with concern over pesticide use in their areas; and public interest groups that advocate for worker and bystander safety. Opposition to this proposal would be growers/producers, as well as agricultural chemical producers.

D. Justification

Continuing the AMN is important to fulfill DPR's mandate to monitor the possible long-term adverse effects of pesticide use. Terminating the AMN in 2015 would provide data that represents only a snapshot in time limited to the period of the study. Factors, like crop patterns, pest pressures, pesticide use, and residential developments, will continue to change over time and an ongoing AMN would track the resulting changes in pesticide exposure. Without the AMN, DPR will have little information about how changes in pesticide use affect their concentrations in community air and their possible effects and no data to allow DPR to evaluate effectiveness of any mitigation measures it may have to implement. Restarting the AMN after sampling has been discontinued would mean obtaining permission from and re-establishing locations, as well as training personnel who may be new to the project.

Current resources do not permit DPR to completely fulfill its mandate (and DPR's Strategic Plan Goal 1 Objective) to continuously evaluate and respond to human health risks from pesticides due to acute, subchronic, and chronic exposures. Since 2011 DPR has redirected existing resources from the Air Program to implement the AMN. During that time, DPR has been extremely limited in its ability to conduct the bystander application-site air monitoring studies necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of existing or new controls to prevent acute exposure. DPR has postponed many bystander application-site air monitoring studies during the past four years. For example, DPR has established permit conditions for methyl-isothiocyanate (MITC) applications, but has not been able to test the efficacy of all these permit conditions. DPR has used modeling and made assumptions to develop some of the conditions. To best protect the health of California's residents, DPR needs to gather data for acute as well as subchronic and chronic exposures to evaluate and improve protective measures against pesticide exposure

Therefore, DPR requests ongoing resources for 1.5 permanent scientific positions and contract funds for laboratory analysis to continue the AMN. Receiving these additional, ongoing funds would make existing resources available for DPR to conduct (acute) bystander application-site air monitoring studies ***and*** continue the AMN.

Although DPR initially envisioned the AMN as a limited-term project with a specific start and end date, results from the last four years demonstrate the need for the AMN to be continued. In 2011 and 2012, no pesticides were detected at or above levels that would pose harm to human health. However, for the last two years both 1,3-dichloropropene (1,3-D, which is also a cancer risk) and chloropicrin (subchronic exposure) exceeded health-protective screening levels. As resources permit, DPR plans to continue to track these pesticides. Having an ongoing AMN will allow DPR to monitor subsequent changes in pesticide concentrations in air and develop and implement mitigation measures, as needed. Without the AMN, DPR can only estimate long-term exposure to pesticides in air through modeling. An ongoing AMN is the best approach to providing long-term protection for California's residents.

If DPR continues to support the AMN by redirecting existing funds from the Air Program and away from acute bystander studies, DPR will be extremely limited in its ability to do other critical air monitoring, sampling analysis, and activities for field studies that support other essential components of DPR's Air Program. These components, such as bystander application-site air monitoring studies, have been suspended until the AMN project is completed (December 2015). However, information from these types of studies is also essential. For example, in its last bystander application-site air monitoring study conducted in 2011, DPR monitored a field application to determine whether the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA's) suggested five-day holding time for a particular kind of impermeable tarp was adequate to ensure that concentrations of 1,3-D and chloropicrin did not exceed health protective screening levels. Results from this study showed that the five-day holding time was inadequate, which underscores the importance of this kind of monitoring. Based on the results of this California-specific work, DPR now requires a nine-day holding time.

Without additional funding, DPR will be unable to continue the AMN which allows DPR to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of its Air Program. DPR also will be unable to make realistic estimates regarding trends in pesticide exposure and risk. The proposed ongoing AMN will fill a crucial gap in determining the risk of pesticides to the general public. For example, data from the AMN indicated cause for concern about the cancer risk posed by 1,3-D. Based on this information, DPR no longer allows growers to exceed township/range caps. In addition, each year's data are added to the lifetime cancer risk database, increasing its accuracy. Food, water, and air are the major ways people are exposed to pesticides. Air is the only major exposure pathway for which continuous pesticide monitoring is not currently conducted by any agency.

E. Outcomes and Accountability

Approving this proposal will provide DPR the necessary scientific staff and contract funds for laboratory sample analysis to continue its AMN. Providing ongoing funding for the AMN will allow DPR to fulfill its mandate to provide a comprehensive program for the continuous evaluation of all registered pesticides. If this proposal were funded, DPR would continue to provide annual reports and public presentations to

show air monitoring results, effectiveness of mitigation measures, and the need for new mitigation measures, as shown in the Projected Outcomes table below. DPR also provides documents that describe results from the acute bystander application-site air monitoring studies.

By ensuring funding for both DPR's acute application-site monitoring studies and the AMN DPR will be able to exercise its authority to mitigate pesticide risks to the environment and public health, based on the best scientific data available.

Projected Outcomes *(Hours required)*

Workload Measure	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Select, Order and Purchase Sample Collection Equipment (e.g., pumps, sorption tubes)	80	40	40	40	40	40
Create and Print Sample Documentation (e.g., Chain of Custody form, Standard Operating Procedures, Sample Labels)	200	100	100	100	100	100
Troubleshoot Equipment	208	160	160	160	160	160
Schedule Sample Collection	52	52	52	52	52	52
Purchase Supplies as Needed (e.g., dry ice)	26	26	26	26	26	26
Arrange Travel for Sampling Trips	39	26	26	26	26	26
Interview and Train New Staff	34	34	34	34	34	34
Collect Samples – Site #1	416	416	416	416	416	416
Collect Samples – Site #2	624	624	624	624	624	624
Collect Samples – Site #3	312	312	312	312	312	312
Transport Samples from Field to Laboratory for Analysis	52	32	32	32	32	32
Enter results into Network Database	416	208	208	208	208	208
Analyze and Evaluate Sampling, Statistical, and Modeling Data	468	208	208	208	208	208
Write AMN Report (including draft edits and responses to stakeholder comments)	583	416	416	416	416	416
Review AMN report	104	52	52	52	52	52
Present Data at Meetings	10	10	10	10	10	10

F. Analysis of All Feasible Alternatives

Alternative #1: End the AMN and return to previous bystander application-site air monitoring activities for acute exposure analysis.

Pro – DPR would be able to continue its bystander application-site monitoring studies, with their resulting benefits. We have a backlog of studies designed to evaluate the effectiveness of several mitigation measures already in place. Our modeling data has shown these measures should be adequate to protect human health, but without field data we can only estimate their effectiveness. Data from these studies allows DPR to respond immediately to acute exposure. Information about acute exposure is important because the potential for acute exposures to occur is greater than that for chronic

(repeated over a long period of time) exposure. Also, more acute exposure health standards exist, which allow us to easily tell when one is exceeded.

Con – The bystander application-site air monitoring studies will only provide limited data with which to estimate subchronic and chronic inhalation exposure to both single and multiples pesticides. Without the AMN data, DPR will not be able to determine the effectiveness of measures designed to address long-term exposure. Without this field data, DPR will return to estimating the exposure through modeling. As shown by the cancer risk from 1,3-dichloropropene mentioned earlier, estimating exposure through modeling is not always as accurate as calculating it from field data.

Alternative #2: Redirect DPR staff and contract funds from within the Environmental Monitoring Branch (Ground Water and Surface Water Programs).

Pro – DPR would be able to continue its AMN with all the resulting benefits, described in the Justification. The Air Program could then use its existing resources to implement its bystander application-site air monitoring studies that have been postponed, which would provide much needed information for acute exposure.

Con – Redirection of staff would require reductions in other statutory Environmental Monitoring (EM) Branch program activities. EM is currently fulfilling its mandated programs as efficiently as possible. The Ground Water Program has its own mandates to fulfill and the Surface Water Program monitoring also fulfills the continuous evaluation mandate. Redirection of staff and contract funds for laboratory analysis from other EM Branch programs would result in reductions in the activities of other critical programs (e.g., Ground Water Protection and Surface Water Monitoring) that protect human health. Such reductions could put DPR at risk of lawsuits and contempt of court for failing to meet mandated obligations.

Alternative #3: Request funding and outsource monitoring to a private consultant.

Pro – Some consultants already employ scientists with the appropriate expertise who could continue to maintain the AMN, collect samples and evaluate monitoring data. Hiring consultants would eliminate the need to hire new staff.

Con – Consultants lack background knowledge of DPR's pesticide regulation and risk characterization process. Furthermore, salaries are often higher in the private sector, coupled with significant overhead—thus; the cost per product would be much higher. In addition, extensive DPR resources would still be required to review the consultant's work products. In order to effectively perform much of the work, private consultants would need access to pesticide formulation information that is supplied to DPR on a confidential basis. Finally, some state agencies (e.g.,California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) hesitate to use private consultants because of credibility issues related to court standing. DPR has the credibility to diffuse legal challenges.

Alternative #4: Request funding and outsource program to another state agency.

Pro – The Air Resources Board (ARB) employs staff scientists who possess the necessary expertise. From an economic perspective, the cost of the project would be similar whether DPR or ARB conducted the monitoring but at a significantly lower cost than a private consultant.

Con – DPR will not be able to direct the priorities of another state agency to meet DPR needs in a timely manner. Furthermore, it is unlikely that ARB currently has the scientific personnel necessary to staff an air monitoring network to meet DPR's data needs. In addition, ARB staff lacks specific knowledge about DPR's regulation and risk characterization process, and would need to access pesticide formulation information that is supplied to DPR on a confidential basis. ARB staff are not as familiar with DPR's requirements and processes.

Alternative #5: Obtain federal or other non-state resources.

DPR could apply for federal or other non-state resources to support an ongoing AMN.

Pro – Receiving such funds would enable DPR to carry out both its bystander application-site air monitoring studies and its AMN, thus providing data for acute, subchronic, and chronic exposures, as well as for cancer risk, if appropriate.

Con –DPR is constantly exploring other such funding sources and is in contact with U.S. EPA, but nothing is available. Usually such funds are for a limited time and do not provide ongoing support.

Alternative #6: Appropriate $468,000 from the DPR Fund, and approve staff resources to support an ongoing AMN.

Pro—DPR would be able to implement both bystander application-site air monitoring studies and the AMN network, thus ensuring that DPR would have the best available data to protect human health.

Con -- The recruiting, hiring, and training process would take time. Current staff would have to delay some of their work to accomplish the tasks necessary to bring new staff up to a productive level. The other primary drawback of this alternative is the cost. In addition to the cost of personnel and associated operating expenses, this type of work requires ongoing equipment purchases, travel expenses, and contract funds for laboratory analysis and other services. However, costs can be minimized by using screening methods previously developed.

G. Implementation Plan

Timeline:

July 2016 – December 2016	Hire and train technical staff Reassess target pesticides and monitoring sites Establish new sites and select different pesticides, if necessary Contract with CDFA's Center for Analytical Chemistry to analyze samples
Ongoing	Collect samples and deliver to laboratory every week Track pesticide use trends and air concentrations based on use and weather patterns Continue to determine feasibility of using monitored pesticides as surrogates for other pesticides Evaluate exposure and risk of multiple pesticides Respond promptly to concentrations that exceed health screening levels, if necessary Ensure public participation Provide a written report and communicate findings annually to all interested stakeholders

H. Supplemental Information

$300,000 in contract funds is required for analytical services with the CDFA's Center for Analytical Chemistry.

I. Recommendation

Adopt Alternative #6. Implementing this alternative will enable DPR to continue an AMN that will provide the information to ensure that DPR's regulatory activities effectively mitigate human health impacts. If this proposal is not approved, then DPR will have only modeling data to estimate subchronic and chronic exposures and cancer risk due to various mitigation measures. Modeling data are not as accurate as field data. Using exposure and cancer risk calculated from field data better protects the residents of California.

BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Continuing the Air Monitoring Network

DP Name: 3930-002-BCP-DP-2016-GB

Budget Request Summary

	FY16					
	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Positions - Permanent	0.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Total Positions	**0.0**	**1.5**	**1.5**	**1.5**	**1.5**	**1.5**
Salaries and Wages						
Earnings - Permanent	0	73	73	73	73	73
Earnings - Temporary Help	0	18	18	18	18	18
Total Salaries and Wages	**$0**	**$91**	**$91**	**$91**	**$91**	**$91**
Total Staff Benefits	0	33	33	33	33	33
Total Personal Services	**$0**	**$124**	**$124**	**$124**	**$124**	**$124**
Operating Expenses and Equipment						
5301 - General Expense	0	4	4	4	4	4
5302 - Printing	0	2	2	2	2	2
5304 - Communications	0	4	4	4	4	4
5320 - Travel: In-State	0	4	4	4	4	4
5322 - Training	0	2	2	2	2	2
5324 - Facilities Operation	0	22	22	22	22	22
5340 - Consulting and Professional Services -	0	300	300	300	300	300
5346 - Information Technology	0	6	4	4	4	4
Total Operating Expenses and Equipment	**$0**	**$344**	**$342**	**$342**	**$342**	**$342**
Total Budget Request	**$0**	**$468**	**$466**	**$466**	**$466**	**$466**

Fund Summary

Fund Source - State Operations						
0106 - Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund	0	468	466	466	466	466
Total State Operations Expenditures	**$0**	**$468**	**$466**	**$466**	**$466**	**$466**
Total All Funds	**$0**	**$468**	**$466**	**$466**	**$466**	**$466**

Program Summary

Program Funding						
3540046 - Monitoring and Surveillance	0	234	233	233	233	233
3540055 - Mitigation of Human Health Risk	0	234	233	233	233	233
Total All Programs	**$0**	**$468**	**$466**	**$466**	**$466**	**$466**